BEFORE THE APPEALS BOARD FOR THE KANSAS DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION

BRANDON DIXON Claimant)
VS.))) Docket No. 206,758
UNITED PARCEL SERVICE Respondent) Docket No. 200,738
AND	
LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY Insurance Carrier	}

ORDER

Respondent appeals from an April 11, 1996 preliminary hearing Order wherein Administrative Law Judge Shannon S. Krysl awarded claimant preliminary benefits.

ISSUES

(1) Whether claimant gave timely notice of the alleged accident pursuant to K.S.A. 44-520.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon the evidence presented and for purposes of preliminary hearing, the Appeals Board finds claimant has met his burden of proving that he gave timely notice of accident.

Claimant testified he advised his supervisor of his injury on the same day it occurred. Claimant's supervisor, Rodney Blockyou, testified that he did not recall claimant telling him about straining his groin. However, Mr. Blockyou states that if claimant had reported a work-related accident, he would have followed company procedure by filling out an injury report, which he did not do. Based upon this testimony, respondent contends claimant failed to give timely notice of accident.

Due to the conflicting testimony, the credibility of the witnesses becomes an important consideration. Although claimant's supervisor does not directly dispute claimant's testimony, that is certainly the implication to be drawn therefrom. Furthermore,

it is the conclusion the respondent argues should be drawn. In weighing the evidence and considering the credibility of the witnesses, the Appeals Board takes into consideration the Administrative Law Judge's opportunity to observe the witnesses' testimony. In finding the claim compensable, the Administrative Law Judge must have believed the claimant's testimony. The Appeals Board gives some deference to the conclusions of the Administrative Law Judge in this regard.

Based upon a review of the record as a whole, we find that notice was timely given and that the Order by the Administrative Law Judge should, therefore, be affirmed.

Respondent's counsel, in his brief, refers to a comment attributed to the Administrative Law Judge which does not appear in the record. The reference is apparently intended to show bias or prejudice on the part of the Administrative Law Judge. If that is its purpose, then this is not the method by which such a concern is to be raised. In any event, discussion of matters not contained within the record is improper. Comments by respondent's counsel upon matters outside the record were not considered and had no bearing upon the Appeals Board's decision in this case.

WHEREFORE, it is the finding, decision, and order of the Appeals Board that the preliminary hearing Order dated April 11, 1996 preliminary hearing Order of Administrative Law Judge Shannon S. Krysl should be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

IT	19	SO	\bigcirc	ЭD	F	2 F	D
	ıo	SU	OI.	ZЦ	CI	ᅚ	u.

Dated this	day of June 1996.

BOARD MEMBER

c: Keith L. Mark, Mission, KS Stephen A. McManus, Kansas City, KS Shannon S. Krysl, Administrative Law Judge Philip S. Harness, Director